UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,066	10/30/2003	Shaun Patrick Ryan	SR-001US	8137
PATRICK REI	7590 03/29/201 LLY	EXAMINER		
BOX 7218	CA 05061 7010	AKINTOLA, OLABODE		
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95061-7218			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/697,066	RYAN, SHAUN PATRICK
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	OLABODE AKINTOLA	3691
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periorally reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froute, cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E 	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is constant.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) \(\overline{\text{N}} \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summa	ry (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-17 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 35 U.S.C § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Here, Applicant's method steps are not tied to a particular machine and do not perform a transformation. Thus, the claims are non-statutory.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Risk Management Solutions, Inc (www.rms.com, September 18, 2002, Terrorism Risk Brochure titled "Understanding and Managing Terrorism Risk" and associated webpages) (hereinafter referred to as RMS).

Re claims 1-29: RMS teaches a method of assigning a quantitative risk value to a property, the quantitative risk value proportionally related to the likelihood of terrorist action against the property, comprising: receiving an evaluation of the susceptibility to damage of the property by a terrorist action that may affect the at least one aspect of the property; receiving an evaluation of the likelihood of a terrorist action directed against the property; and determining the quantitative risk value of the property at least partially in relationship to (1) the evaluation of the susceptibility to damage by terrorist action of the at least one aspect of the property, and (2) the evaluation of the likelihood of a terrorist action directed against the property, whereby the quantitative risk value may be used by an insurer in setting an insurance premium for an insurance policy (paragraphs 1-87).

Art Unit: 3691

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henderson et al (USPAP 20040249679).

Re claims 1-29: Henderson teaches a method of assigning a quantitative risk value to a property, the quantitative risk value proportionally related to the likelihood of terrorist action against the property, comprising: receiving an evaluation of the susceptibility to damage of the property by a terrorist action that may affect the at least one aspect of the property; receiving an evaluation of the likelihood of a terrorist action directed against the property; and determining the quantitative risk value of the property at least partially in relationship to (1) the evaluation of the susceptibility to damage by terrorist action of the at least one aspect of the property, and (2) the evaluation of the likelihood of a terrorist action directed against the property, whereby the quantitative risk value may be used by an insurer in setting an insurance premium for an insurance policy (abstract, figures, paragraphs 7-16, 28-107).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLABODE AKINTOLA whose telephone number is (571)272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,066 Page 5

Art Unit: 3691

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Olabode Akintola/ Examiner, Art Unit 3691